

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 TYRONE E. BELL,) Case No. CV 11-7858-FMO (RNB)
12 Plaintiff,)
13 vs.) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
14 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,)
15 et al.,)
16 Defendants.)

17 On March 21, 2013, the Court issued a Minute Order requiring plaintiff to
18 appear before the Court on April 19, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. (i.e., Courtroom 6D of the
19 Santa Ana courthouse) for the purpose of having his deposition conducted under the
20 Court's auspices. In its Minute Order, the Court expressly admonished plaintiff that,
21 if he was not present when the case was called at 9:00 a.m., he would be sanctioned.


22 Although plaintiff was not present at 9:00 a.m., the Court waited until
23 approximately 9:20 a.m. before calling the case. Defendants' counsel was present
24 with a court reporter. Plaintiff was not present.

25 Based on plaintiff's failure to appear for his deposition as ordered, and also his
26 failure to comply with the Court's March 27, 2013 Order re the three deputy
27 defendants' pending motions for case dispositive sanctions, the Court is now prepared
28 to issue a Report and Recommendation recommending that those three motions be

1 granted.

2 There are no motions for case dispositive sanctions pending on behalf of the
3 other defendants (i.e., the County of Los Angeles and Sheriff Baca). However, based
4 on his failure to appear for his duly-ordered deposition (which would have been taken
5 on behalf of all the defendants), plaintiff is ordered to show cause in writing on or
6 before **May 20, 2013** why the Court should not also recommend the dismissal of this
7 action in its entirety pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). Plaintiff is admonished that
8 his failure to timely file a response to this Order to Show Cause will be deemed by
9 the Court as another violation of a Court order and also as evidence of his lack of
10 prosecution, which will constitute another basis for recommending to the District
11 Judge that this action be dismissed. See Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-
12 30, 82 S. Ct. 1386, 1388, 8 L. Ed. 2d 734, reh'g denied, 371 U.S. 873, 83 S. Ct. 115,
13 9 L. Ed. 2d 112 (1962); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440 (9th Cir. 1988).

14
15 DATED: April 19, 2013



16
17
18 ROBERT N. BLOCK
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28